

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 ROLLAND C. HANLEY, JR.,

No. CIV S-03-2313 MCE GGH P

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

ORDER

14 SCHMIDT, ET AL.,

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed
18 this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
19 The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge
20 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No.
21 262.

22 On May 19, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and
23 recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which
24 contained notice to all parties that any objections to the
25 findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days.

26 ///

1 On June 20, 2005, plaintiff was granted a thirty day extension of
2 time in which to file and serve his objections. Plaintiff has
3 filed objections to the findings and recommendations.¹

4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C.
5 § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a
6 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
7 entire
8 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be
9 supported by the record and by proper analysis.


10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

11 1. The findings and recommendations filed May 19, 2005, are
12 adopted in full;

13 2. Defendants' March 10, 2005, motion to dismiss is
14 granted; and

15 3. This action is dismissed.

16 DATED: September 28, 2005

17
18 
19 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24

25 ¹Within his objections, plaintiff does not provide any substantive reason for having failed
26 to file a timely opposition. The court will not allow objections to take the place of an opposition
that could and should have been filed in conformity with the court's motion procedure.